

good lawyer who might never have encountered such an action before in the course of his experience.

Note this fact well. Our attorney in the South writes as follows:

"In *Magee vs. Tittle*, pending in San Diego, it will be well for the Society to note that our client, Dr. Magee, was insured by some defense or casualty company, but as the policy contained a clause written in fine print to the effect that the insurance company would not defend where the claim arose on a cross-complaint, they refused to defend for him. Dr. Magee tells me that in San Diego there were about ten physicians who gave up their policies in this particular company on account of that clause."

What do *you* think of that sort of insurance? A patient owed a doctor a just debt. The doctor brought suit to collect what was due him. The patient, to scare him off, brought a counter suit or "cross-complaint" alleging malpractice. And then the "insurance" company brought out its little "joker" and refused to defend this doctor who had been paying them money under the mistaken belief that he would be defended. What happened? Why, the physician in question, being a member in good standing, is having his suit defended by the State Society at no cost to himself. *Which form of protection really protects?*

What do *you* think about that form of "insurance?" This game of "bilking the doctor" is a very lovely one—for the patient who waits to avoid paying his bill. It costs him less to file a malpractice suit than to pay his bill and, unfortunately, the majority of physicians have, in the past, let the matter stop there rather than be brought into an expensive lawsuit. But now, through co-operation, we have put a stop to that game. The State Society will defend all such actions. Of course any members who wish to keep on paying money to insurance companies for that sort of "insurance" may do so. It just helps the companies to get richer and gives the physician not the slightest atom of protection more than he is assured by simply keeping up his membership. And, furthermore, just stop and think that quite possibly about the time you really need protection, the "insurance" company will probably find some clause in the policy that releases it and puts the financial burden back upon you. The JOURNAL has avoided all criticism of insurance companies, for it was the opinion of the Council that a dignified attitude of silence should be maintained. But when a case like this comes along it is high time that our members were in possession of the facts.

Another lie that is being circulated by the agents of certain insurance companies is to the effect that the State Society could not afford to defend an action on appeal in case a verdict were given for the plaintiff. That is absolutely untrue. If any agent tells you that, he is telling you what is not

true. We have already referred to this in the JOURNAL, but now repeat the assurance.

Medical defense by the State Society is absolute protection; defense by some insurance company may or may not be protection.

There are so many "glooms" in the work-day world that it is a blessing when a few "joys" come along and put them to rout. Also,

DOCTOR thank the Lord for a sense of
WILEY. humor! Since the crafty plot to discredit Dr. Wiley and practically put

an end to the enforcement of the Pure Food and Drugs law failed, various and sundry trade journals have been full of the bitterest sort of editorial matter relating to the incident and attacking Dr. Wiley. The *Western Druggist*, largely supported by nostrum advertising, calls "the Wiley 'vindication' a triumph of hypocrisy and unlawful 'precedent'"; the *American Food Journal* has a somewhat less bitter article; other publications are more or less bitter, but they all howl the same song. "We want pure foods and drugs—surely—but we do not want a man who is going to enforce the Pure Food and Drugs act; such conduct interferes with business!" Why this strange unanimity in attack upon Wiley? It is so childishly simple, the explanation! Nearly all these trade publications (like nearly all medical (?) journals) are supported in great measure by the advertisements of things that have no honest or legitimate excuse for living. The quack, fraudulent, adulterated thing that makes a lot of money for the promoter is widely advertised; it lives on advertising just as the professional abortionist does. Stop the advertising and you kill the evil. These trade publications (also like the majority of medical (?) journals) want the money, clean or dirty. The enforcement of the Pure Food and Drugs act has killed off a good many and will kill off a good many more; and when they are killed—when the frauds can no longer be marketed—it is a waste of money to advertise them. Therefore the attitude of the trade journals. Is it not simple? Yes, my child.

Distinctly gratifying to the profession of this state must be Dr. Blue's appointment by President

SURGEON-GENERAL Taft to the post of Surgeon-General of the U.
RUPERT BLUE. S. Public Health and

Marine Hospital Service, and in commenting upon this promotion we not only heartily congratulate the doctor, but just as heartily the country. Rupert Blue has on past occasions been publicly and privately deluged with the thanks of California, and particularly San Francisco, for his monumentally efficient labors in his sanitation work out here, and it is not our purpose to embarrass him with another saccharin effusion. He knows that we hold him in the highest esteem personally as well as professionally, so we'll let it go at that and address no further words to him along that score. Still, while we talk it over among ourselves, we must confess that it warms our cardiac cockles to see "Unser Ru-